

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 remain pending in the subject Application. In the Office Action
5 dated 08/16/2002 ("Office Action"), claims 1-28 were rejected. In the amendment
set forth above, Claims 1, 25, 26, and 28 are amended, and the remaining Claims
are unchanged. In view of the amendments set forth above, and the arguments
presented below, it is respectfully requested the rejections to the Claims have been
overcome, and an Early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 1-28 are pending in the subject Application.

2. Claims 1-12, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Claim 1 and 25 have been amended to replace all occurrences of "said device" with "said special device". Claim 26 has been amended to recite an apparatus rather than a method, and to clarify the term "user selection". Finally, Claim 28 has been amended to recite a storage medium rather than a method, and to clarify the term "software". With these changes, it is believed all matters related to form have been corrected, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

3. The Examiner's presumption concerning the ownership of the subject matter of the various Claims of the subject Application is correct.

4. Claims 1, 3-22, 25, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,603,034 to Swanson ("Swanson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,620 B1 to Jawahar et al. ("Jawahar"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Before addressing the rejection in detail, the Examiner's position, as best understood, is summarized for discussion purposes with respect to the limitations of Applicants' Claim 1. This position will be discussed in reference to Swanson Figure

6.

Applicants' Claim 1, as amended, appears as follows:

1. A method for executing methods upon data objects distributed across a plurality of nodes of a system from a special device comprising the steps of:

providing a first graphical interface display on said special device permitting user selection of a data object category, selection of such category

resulting in display of a list of data objects available on the system;
responding to selection of a first of the data objects present in said list to
generate a second graphical interface display on said special device of at
least a portion of the contents of said first of the data objects together with a
display of a plurality of selectable regions, each of said regions representing
a respective method executable on said first data object; and
responding to selection of one of said methods to execute that method
upon the first data object and to display a first result of such execution on said
special device.

The Examiners assertions in regards to Claim 1 will be considered in turn, as follows:

a.) The Examiner states that the providing step is taught by the resource category selection object that includes a list of selectable resource category objects. This resource category selection object is shown as menu item 920 of Swanson Figure 6. Using this menu item, the user is allowed to select a category of editable resources, also referred to as a resource category object. (Swanson column 10 lines 40-44.) In Figure 6, the resource category object "General" is shown being displayed in the resource category object. (Swanson column 11 lines 17-20.)

When a resource category object is displayed, the corresponding resource descriptors are displayed in a scrollable window 940 of Swanson Figure 6. For example, the resource descriptors listed in Figure 6 include "bottom shadow color", "bottom shadow pixmap", and etc. The Examiner therefore appears to be asserting that the Swanson resource descriptors, which are displayed upon selection of a resource category object, are analogous to Applicants' data objects, which are displayed upon selection of Applicants' data object category. This understanding appears to be confirmed on page 11 of the Office Action, wherein the Examiner states that the data object category of the present invention is equivalent to Swanson's resource category selection object, making data objects equivalent to the Swanson resource descriptors. If this understanding is incorrect, and this rejection is maintained, clarification is respectfully requested.

b.) Next, it appears that the Examiner is asserting that the display shown

in Swanson window 940 is teaching Applicants' first responding step. This conclusion is drawn from the Examiner's citation of columns 3 and 4 of Swanson (Office Action page 4, third full paragraph), and from the fact that the Examiner, as best understood, is equating the Swanson descriptor resources with Applicants' objects. If this understanding is incorrect, and this rejection is maintained, clarification is respectfully requested.

c.) Finally, the Examiner cites Swanson column 5 lines 58 through column 6 line 34 for teaching Applicants' second responding step. This step involves responding to selection of a method such that the method is executed on the data object and the results of this execution are displayed.

The cited passage of Swanson describes the use of programming "widgets", which are object-oriented programming entities that applications can use to construct a graphical user interface. (Swanson column 6 lines 5-8.) As best understood, the Examiner appears to be equating these widgets with Applicants' methods. Again, if this understanding is incorrect, and this rejection is maintained, clarification is requested.

With the above summary of the rejection provided for discussion purposes, the particulars of the rejection as it relates to Applicants' Claim 1 are considered in more detail.

For discussion purposes, and to provide a starting point for the discussion, it will be accepted that the Swanson resource category selection object 920 of Figure 6 is analogous to Applications first graphical interface display, and the Swanson selectable resource category objects are analogous to Applicants' user selection of a data object category. It follows, then, that the resulting display of resource descriptors in the Swanson window 940 is considered analogous to Applicants' list of data objects available on the system. Therefore, the Swanson resource descriptor is analogous to Applicants' data object.

Discussion will now turn to Applicants' first responding step. In this step, a

user selects a first data object, and in response, a second graphical interface display is created. The display includes at least a portion of the contents of the data object together with a display of a plurality of selectable regions, each region representing a respective method executable on the data object.

5 Applicants' first responding step corresponds to the aspect of Applicants' system wherein a list of data objects is displayed for a user. A user then selects one of the data objects. In response to this selection, a display menu having selectable regions is presented to the user, wherein each of the regions relates to a corresponding method. Selection of a region (as by touching a portion of a touch-
10 screen) results in execution of the corresponding method on the selected data object. (Claim 1, lines 6-12.) This is discussed, for example, in reference to Applicants' Figure 5, which shows the "sort", "search", and "compute" methods being displayed in response to selection of the "sales" object. (See Applicants' Specification page 8, line 15 through page 9, line 9.)

15 It is respectfully asserted that Swanson does not teach or suggested this first responding step for the following reasons:

a.) Swanson does not teach or suggest Applicants' *selection of a data object*, whereby a *second graphical interface display* containing methods to be executed on
20 the data object is generated on the screen. In fact, in Swanson, this step of generating a second graphical interface display is entirely absent. In Swanson, the list of available objects (resource descriptors) includes anything that might be considered a "method". This can best be understood by returning to Figure 6.

In Figure 6, window 940 displays a list of Swanson objects, which are the
25 resource descriptors shown as "bottom shadow color", "bottom shadow pixmap", and etc. For each of these objects, a horizontal row is depicted that includes a value display field 960, and a single selection object 970, as follows:

30 "Each horizontal group corresponds to a single editable resource that includes a resource descriptor, a resource value display field and a resource value selection object." (Swanson column 11 lines 59-61.)

The value display field 960 displays the current value of the resource descriptor. For example, the current value of resource descriptor "bottom shadow color" is shown as "medium aquamarine". The selection object 970 may provide the user with choices for the resource descriptor. For the resource descriptor "bottom shadow color", for example, the selection object provides a pop-up menu that allows a user to select a color. For other resource descriptors such as "bottom shadow pixmap", selection object 970 directs the user to enter a choice in the corresponding display field.

Extending the Examiner's analogy from above, the value display field 960 and selection object 970 would appear to be analogous to Applicants' methods, since these fields provide the user with the only selectable mechanism for performing an operation that relates to the respective object. Moreover, these are the only screen regions ever displayed for a given Swanson object.

As can be appreciated from the foregoing discussion, Swanson does not teach or suggest the step of selecting an object, then generating a second display that illustrates all possible methods that can be executed for the selected object. Instead, the one and only method available for execution on an object is shown with the object on the same horizontal row when the list of objects is generated in window 940. This is possible in the Swanson system because each Swanson object is associated with only a single "method", as is discussed further in the following paragraph.

b.) Swanson does not teach or suggest generating a graphical interface display that includes a *plurality of selectable regions*, each representing a method that can be executed on the selected object. In Swanson, each object (resource descriptor) is associated with a *single screen region* that may be used to perform some type of operation on the object. For example, for the resource descriptor "bottom shadow color", screen region 970 may be used to invoke a menu used to update the resource value. However, there is no other "method" available to perform on this resource descriptor. Similarly, for the resource descriptor "bottom shadow pixmap", screen region 960 is used to update the resource value. In sum, each

Swanson object is provided with a single so-called "method" that may be used to update that resource descriptor. Multiple methods are not available to be executed on a given Swanson object. Moreover, the Swanson system does not provide a plurality of selectable screen regions, each representing a respective method to be executed on a given object.

Finally, it may be noted that because there is only a *single screen region* available for each Swanson object, the list of objects can also include the available "methods", wherein each "method" is on the same row as its object. For this reason, Swanson does not require the creation of the second graphical interface display, as discussed in paragraph a.) above. In contrast, in Applicants' system, many methods exist for an object, and a second display must be created for a given object to accommodate all available methods.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Swanson does not teach or suggest Applicants' first responding step.

Turning now to Applications second responding step, this step involves responding to selection of one of the plurality of methods, executing that method upon the data object, and displaying the result of such execution on the device. Swanson does not teach this step for the following reasons:

a.) First, in Swanson, there is no selection between multiple methods. In Applicants' system, a user chooses between functions such as "search", "sort", "compute", or "refresh" to select an operation that will be performed on a given object. In contrast, for a given Swanson object (resource descriptor), there is only one choice available. For example, for the resource descriptor "bottom shadow color", the user can use the so-called "method" provided in the single screen region shown as window 970 to select a new color. That is the only functional "choice" available.

b.) Swanson does not teach "executing a method upon a data object" as that term is described within Applicants' Specification and used within Claim 1.

Applicants' Specification summarizes the manner in which a method is executed on a data object on pages 13 lines 26 through page 17 of Applicants' Specification. This passage describes how data stored within a data object is manipulated in some manner to produce a result. This usage conforms to what would be understood as the "ordinary" meaning of the phrase "executing a method upon a data object".

Swanson does not teach any method of "executing a method upon a data object. Returning to the Examiner's analogy of the foregoing paragraphs wherein Applicants' objects correspond to Swanson resource descriptors, any Swanson "method" would correspond to what is provided by screen regions 960 or 970 of Figure 6. For example, a user is allowed to select a new color for the resource descriptor "bottom shadow color" using the "method" single screen region 970. However, this Swanson "method" is no more than a menu which allows the use to manually select a new value to be stored by the resource descriptor variable "bottom shadow color". This does not involve *execution upon* any data that is stored within the object, as is claimed by Applicants' claim 1, and for this additional reason, Swanson does not teach or suggest Applicants' second responding step of Claim 1.

c.) As discussed in the foregoing paragraphs, it would seem the Examiner's analogy between the Swanson resource descriptors and Applicants' objects would lead to the conclusion that the Swanson screen regions 960 and 970 correspond to Applicants' methods. However, the Examiner instead appears to be asserting that the Swanson "widgets" teach Applicants' methods. (Office Action page 4, fourth full paragraph, citing Swanson column 5 line 5 through column 6 line 34.) This assertion will therefore be considered as follows.

As noted above, widgets are object-oriented programming entities that applications can use to construct a graphical user interface. (Swanson column 6 lines 5-8.) As discussed in Swanson, widgets "...utilize application "resources" to specify window characteristics such as background and foreground color, the appearance of text fonts, the shape and configuration of screen cursors, and other graphical attributes." (Swanson column 6 lines 36-40.) The graphical resource

editor as shown in Figure 6 allows the user to modify these resource descriptors in the manner described above. (Swanson column 6 lines 50-53.)

As noted previously, Applicants' Claim 1 describes *executing a method upon on object*. As defined in Applicants' Specification, and as used in accordance with the plain meaning of these terms, this refers to using the method to manipulate the data stored within the data object in some manner to achieve a result. It is not understood how the Swanson widgets teach or suggest this aspect of Applicants' invention. Moreover, it may be noted that the widgets are not associated with any selectable plurality of screen regions, as are Applicants' methods. If this rejection is maintained, clarification of the perceived teaching of the cited passage is requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it does not appear that anything in Swanson teaches or suggests Applicants' first or second responding steps, and this rejection should be withdrawn. If this rejection is maintained, clarification as to the supposed teaching of Swanson is respectfully requested.

Next, the data objects may be considered in more detail. In this discussion, the Examiner's analogy between the Swanson resource descriptors and Applicants' objects will be continued. According to Applicants' invention as claimed in Claim 1, Applicants' objects are distributed across a plurality of nodes. For example, Applicants' Figure 23 illustrates a plurality of nodes 11 through 17. Data objects may be located in any of these nodes. (Applicants' Specification page 11 lines 22-23.)

In contrast to Applicants' invention, the objects (resource descriptors) of Swanson are included within a single client application on a single system. Specifically, the Swanson resource editor is used to update the objects (resource descriptors) of an application (Swanson column 6 lines 56-58). This application, which is shown as application 110 of Figure 1, may be "...located at a remote platform, or within the data processing system 10..." (Swanson column 5 lines 50-51.) There is no teaching or suggestion what-so-ever within Swanson that the

Swanson objects are distributed across multiple nodes. For at least this additional reason, Swanson does not teach or suggest Applicants' Claim 1.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Swanson does not teach or suggest Applicants' invention of Claim 1. Furthermore, nothing in Jawahar, alone or in combination with Swanson, teaches or suggests any of the aspects of Applicants' Claim 1 that are discussed above. For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is allowable over the current rejection, which should be withdrawn.

Finally, as discussed by the Examiner, Applicants' Claim 1 describes practicing the invention using a special device. In contrast to Applicants' Claim 1, Swanson describes a graphical editor in a digital processing system that is described as being any of a number of *conventional processor devices* including, but not limited to, processors commonly found in that class of data processing apparatus known as work stations. (Swanson column 5 lines 6-9, emphasis added.) While the Examiner acknowledges this is true, the Examiner asserts that Jawahar teaches the use of a telephony system that interacts with a server, and that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine this teaching with Swanson to obtain Applicants' invention of Claim 1.

In Jawahar, data is stored on an information storage mechanism. An individual customer or another system may access this stored data. The accessed data is tracked so that if the user requires help, a request may be directed to the appropriate individual such as an agent that can provide assistance. (Jawahar column 2 lines 66 through column 3 line 1, and column 3 lines 7-11.) The user may request help in any number of ways, including via email, a fax machine, telephone, an Internet phone application, or any combination thereof. (Jawahar column 5 lines 4-8.)

After the help request is routed to the appropriate agent, any information that is needed to provide an answer to the request is obtained. The agent may then respond to the request in any number of ways, included via a telephone that is coupled to the agent's computer system 10, as shown in Jawahar Figure 2. This

phone may be controlled by a telephony application 74. (Jawahar column 6 lines 22-24.) A control server 64 is also provided to establish and maintain multiple communication links of the type discussed above between multiple pairs of agents and customers. (Jawahar column 7 lines 18-24.)

5 As may be noted from the Jawahar description, Jawahar discloses use of a telephone as may be coupled to a customer's computer. (See Jawahar Figure 1.) Such a telephone is used in a conventional manner to make a voice request to obtain help in accessing data. An agent may respond to the help request by using a telephone that is coupled to the agent's computer to establish voice communication.

10 Thus, at most, Jawahar teaches the use of a telephone to establish voice communication. Jawahar does not teach, or even begin to suggest, the use of a special device such as a cell phone having any type of a graphical interface that can be used to select and execute methods upon data objects. In fact, it does not appear that Jawahar mentions use of a cell phone at all, even for use in establishing

15 voice communication. In sum, Jawahar does not, alone or in combination with Swanson, teach or suggest any aspect of Applicants' invention. For this additional reason, this rejection is improper, and should be withdrawn.

 Finally, there is no motivation whatsoever to combine Swanson with Jawahar. Although the Examiner states that both references "...teach alternative means of

20 communicating" (Office Action page 5 line 7), this is not understood. Swanson teaches a resource editor that is used to modify selectable parameters associated with graphical user interfaces, and does not appear to have anything to do with a communication system of any type. In contrast, Jawahar relates to a system that may be employed in call centers to allow a customer seeking help to obtain

25 information from an appropriate agent via a voice link. The two references solve entirely different problems in ways that are entirely unrelated. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

 Turning now to a discussion of Claims 3-12, these Claims depend from

30 Claim 1, and are allowable over the current rejection for at least the reasons set forth

with respect to Claim 1. In addition, these Claims include other aspects of the invention not taught or suggested by Swanson or Jawahar, alone or in combination, as follows:

5 Claim 3 describes a second method executed on a first result. It will be recalled from the foregoing discussion that any "first result" was obtained from executing a "first method" on a selected data object. Using the Examiner's analogy that was discussed in detail above, this relates to selecting a value for a resource descriptor using either window 960 or 970 of Figure 6. For example, this might
10 involve selecting a new color to be stored within the resource descriptor "bottom shadow color" of Figure 6. However, performing this type of "method" on the Swanson "object" does not generate any "result" on which a second method might be executed. Moreover, Swanson does not teach or suggest anything that could be construed as such.

15 The Examiner cites Swanson column 10 lines 25-30, and column 11 lines 4-8 for this teaching. However, the cited description in Swanson appears to describe the automated way in which a custom interface window 300 (Swanson Figure 6) is generated from the selected application's app-custom file. This window must be created before any updating of the Swanson "objects" can occur according to a
20 Swanson "first method". Therefore, it is not understood how this process teaches Applicants' second method that is executed on the first result of the first method. If this rejection is maintained, additional clarification is requested.

 Claim 4 describes each of the methods as comprising a transaction. The results of each transaction are sequentially displayed, and become the basis for the
25 next operation in the sequence of transactions. As noted above, no methods, transactions or otherwise, are performed on the Swanson objects. Instead, the user merely selects a value to be stored within a resource descriptor. This does not comprise any type of "transaction" as that term is defined within Applicants' Specification. For the foregoing additional reason, Swanson does not teach or
30 suggest Applicants' Claim 4.

The Examiner cites column 5, line 58 through column 6, line 21 as teaching this aspect of Applicants' invention. The cited passage appears to describe libraries of routines that may be called by client applications for constructing graphical user interfaces. The perceived significance of this passage is not understood, and clarification is respectfully requested if this rejection is maintained.

Claim 5 depends from Claim 1 and is allowable over this rejection for at least the reasons described above in reference to Claim 1.

Claim 6 depends from Claim 1 and is allowable over this rejection for at least the reasons described above in reference to Claim 1. Claim 6 further describes the first method as comprising a summation of records. Swanson does not teach or suggest any summation method that is performed on a resource descriptor. Moreover, Jawahar does not add anything to Swanson to teach or suggest this aspect of Applicants' invention. Therefore Claim 6 is allowable over this rejection for this additional reason.

The Examiner asserts that this aspect of the invention is taught by Swanson column 14 lines 17-37. This passage relates to a step involving generation of custom interface window 300 of Figure 6. It is not understood how this passage relates to performing a summation method on a selected object, and clarification is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 depends from Claim 1 and is allowable over this rejection for at least the reasons described above in reference to Claim 1. Claim 7 further describes the first method as comprising selection of a record having a particular attribute. Swanson does not teach or suggest any such method being performed on a resource descriptor. For this additional reason, Swanson does not teach or suggest the current invention. Jawahar does not add anything to Swanson to teach or suggest this aspect of Applicants' invention, and Claim 7 is therefore allowable over this rejection for this additional reason.

Claim 8 depends from Claim 7 and is allowable over this rejection for at least the reasons described above in reference to Claim 7.

Claims 9-11 depend from Claim 3 and are allowable over this rejection for at

least the reasons described above in reference to Claim 3. These Claims describe additional aspects associate with Applicants' second method. Because the cited combination of references does not teach or even suggest this type of a second method, this rejection is improper, and should be withdrawn.

5 Claim 12 depends from Claim 11 and is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above in reference to Claim 11.

Turning now to independent method Claim 13, this independent method Claim includes scopes and aspects that are similar to those discussed above in reference to Claim 1. For reasons similar to those set forth above, Claim 13 is
10 allowable over this rejection, which should be withdrawn. Claims 14-22 depend, directly or indirectly, on Claim 13, and are likewise allowable over this rejection.

Independent apparatus Claim 25 includes aspects similar in nature to those discussed above in reference to Claim 1, and is allowable over the cited combination of referenced for reasons similar to those discussed above.

15 Independent apparatus Claim 27 includes a storage medium encoded with program code comprising a graphical user interface for a special device. The code allows executing a sequence of transactions upon data on a screen display of the special device. As discussed above, the cited combination of references does not teach or suggest an interface for a special device as that term is defined by
20 Applicants' Specification. Moreover, the cited combination of references does not teach or suggest executing a sequence of transactions upon data on a screen. For at least these reasons, the cited combination of references does not teach or suggest the aspects of Claim 27, and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 28 depends from Claim 27, and is allowable over the current rejection
25 for the reasons discussed above in reference to Claim 28.

5. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson in view of Jawahar and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,414,809 to Hogan et al. ("Hogan"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

30 Claim 2 describes a point and touch operation that is performed to achieve

user selection of a data object. The Examiner agrees that Swanson and Jawahar do not teach this type of operation, but states that Hogan does.

Hogan describes a computer-based graphics interface for graphically illustrating data that has been retrieved from a database system. (See, for example, Hogan column 3 lines 5-7.) Although Hogan describes one embodiment of a graphical user interface, it does not appear that Hogan describes any type of general-purpose editor for editing such an interface. Thus, Swanson and Hogan are targeted at solving completely different problems. Moreover, Jawahar solves an entirely different third type of problem. Because all of the cited references are directed to solving different problems in different ways, there is no motivation to make the cited combination of references, and this rejection is therefore improper. Claim 2 is allowable over this rejection, which should be withdrawn.

6. Claims 23, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson in view of Hogan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,169,991 to Tsukahara et al. ("Tsukahara"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 23 includes aspects that are similar to those discussed above in reference to Claim 1. This Claim is therefore allowable over this rejection for reasons similar to those discussed above in reference to Claim 1. In addition, Claim 23 includes a special device having a display screen, and a point and touch interaction mechanism. The Examiner states that the point and touch aspects of the invention are taught by Hogan, and the display screen is taught by Tsukahara.

First, Tsukahara is considered. Tsukahara describes a client server system that can be coupled to multiple client machine devices. Each client machine device executes a database data generation task and a database data processing task which each corresponds to a different function. When a workload concentration state exists in a first client machine device, another client machine device is caused to executed the function that originally was the responsibility of the first device. (Tsukahara Abstract and column 3.)

The Examiner states that item 98 of Tsukahara Figure 18 discloses use of a

display screen. Item 98 is described as a "man/machine CRT display processing task for executing processing according to an operator instruction". (Tsukahara column 1 lines 44-47.) This cursory reference to a CRT processing task does not disclose the use of a special device having a display screen of the type suitable for use in Applicants' invention. Moreover, there is no motivation whatsoever to combine any teachings of the Tsukahara client/server system with the resource editor of Swanson, or the graphics interface of Hogan. All three references solve entirely different problems in entirely different ways. One skilled in the art would not be motivated to take teachings from these three diverse references and combine them as the Examiner is suggesting. The Examiner is piecing the invention together in hindsight, a practice that has long been considered impermissible. For this additional reason, this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 24 depends from Claim 23, and is allowable over this rejection for at least the reasons discussed above in regards to Claim 23.

Claim 26 depends from Claim 24, and is allowable over this rejection for at least the reasons discussed above in reference to Claim 24. In addition, Claim 26 describes the point and touch operation. For reasons similar to those discussed above in reference to Claim 2, Claim 2 is allowable over this rejection, which should be withdrawn.

7. The responses to Applicants' arguments are appreciated. In particular, the Examiner's response in the first full paragraph of page 11 of the Office Action appears to confirm Applicants' Representative's understanding that the Examiner is equating the Swanson resource descriptors with Applicants' objects. This analogy is discussed in detail above. Additional questions pertaining to this analogy are set forth above, and if this rejection is maintained, clarification is respectfully requested.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon have been reviewed and is considered to be of general interest only.

Conclusion

Claims 1-28 remain pending in the subject Application. In the Office Action dated 08/16/2002, claims 1-28 were rejected. In the amendment set forth above, Claims 1, 25, 26, and 28 are amended, and the remaining Claims are unchanged. In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, it is respectfully requested the rejections to the Claims have been overcome, and an Early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has questions or concerns about this correspondence, a call to the undersigned is encouraged and welcomed.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth L. McMahon 11/18/2002
Beth L. McMahon
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 41,987
Tele No. 651-635-7893

Unisys Corporation
M.S. 4773
P.O. Box 64942
St. Paul, MN 55164-0942

BLM/clk



VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

CHANGES MADE IN THE CLAIMS:

Claim 1 (Twice Amended):

1 1. A method for executing methods upon data objects distributed across
2 a plurality of nodes of a system from a special device comprising the steps of:
3 providing a first graphical interface display on said special device
4 permitting user selection of a data object category, selection of such category
5 resulting in display of a list of data objects available on the system;
6 responding to selection of a first of the data objects present in said list
7 to generate a second graphical interface display on said special device of at
8 least a portion of the contents of said first of the data objects together with a
9 display of a plurality of selectable regions, each of said regions representing
10 a respective method executable on said first data object; and
11 responding to selection of one of said methods to execute that method
12 upon the first data object and to display a first result of such execution on said
13 special device.

Claim 25 (Twice Amended):

1 25. An apparatus for executing methods upon data objects distributed across a
2 plurality of nodes of a system comprising:
3 a special device having a display associated therewith;
4 means providing a first graphical user interface on said display, said
5 interface permitting user selection of a data object category, selection of such
6 category resulting in display of a list of data objects available on the system;
7 means for responding to selection of a first of the data objects present
8 in said list to generate a second graphical user interface on said special
9 device of at least a portion of the contents of said first of the data objects
10 together with a display of a plurality of selectable regions, each of said

11 regions representing a respective method executable on said first data object;
12 and
13 means for responding to selection of one of said methods to execute
14 that method upon the first data object and to display a first result of such
15 execution on said special device.

Claim 26 (Once Amended):

1 26. The [method] apparatus of Claim 24 wherein said user selection of a data
2 object category is achieved by a point and touch operation executed on the
3 graphical interface display.

Claim 28(Once Amended)

- 1 28. The [method] storage medium of Claim 27 wherein said
- 2 agent/messenger software provides user selection of a data object category,
- 3 selection of such category resulting in display of a list of data objects available
- 4 on the system.